



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : **Confirmation No. 7051**  
Hidemasa IIJIMA et al. : Attorney Docket No. 2003-0972A  
Serial No. 10/619,673 : Group Art Unit 1731  
Filed July 16, 2003 : Examiner Mark Halpern  
PAPER MACHINE : **MAIL STOP: AMENDMENT**

---

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED  
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE  
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT  
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of October 3, 2006, Applicants in the above-referenced U.S. patent application hereby request reconsideration of the rejections in the Office Action.

The Examiner rejected claim 18 as being either anticipated or obvious over Sollinger et al., U.S. Patent 6,024,836 (Sollinger). In particular, the Examiner took the position that "it is inherent that the slight difference in speed . . . reads on the claimed range of the increase in speed, or in the least, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art . . . that the increase in speed . . . is within the claimed range because the slight increase in speed is to assure that the web does not tear or break." However, it is submitted that the Examiner's position is counter to the law and what is actually taught by Sollinger.

Claim 18 is a method claim directed to a method of controlling a paper machine in which each driving unit of four belt mechanisms is individually controllable so that the transfer speeds of the wet web can be individually set. In particular, the method requires the transfer of the wet web along the first dryer unit at a speed higher than the transfer speed of the wet web along the most downstream press unit, but no more than 1.04 times the transfer speed of the wet web along the most downstream press unit. The claim further requires that for the second dryer unit the